**IT Gov Minutes**

J

Via Zoom

**Attendees:** Kirk Brown, Noah Daniels, Brenton DeBoef (absent), Gabriele Fariello, Melissa Frost, Brandon Fuller (absent), Marta Gomez-Chiarri, Michael Greenfield, Amanda Izenstark, Shaun Kavanagh (absent), Michael Khalfayan, Ian Lester, Dean Libutti (absent), Matt McDonald (absent), Sanjay Kumar Mupparapu, Linsdey Nottage, John Stringer

**Guest:** none

1. Approval of Minutes
   1. October 2024
   2. Noah moved to approve minutes; Amanda seconded.
   3. All present voted to approve.
2. Project Status Updates
   1. Michael G:
      1. Regarding reducing usage on Google drive – should we share anything with out areas? GF: We are not eliminating Google drive or deleting people’s drives. We are trying have those who use the most amount of space transfer their work to an alternative to use less Google space as URI is now limited and charged for our use.
      2. Noah: When there is a shared Google drive, who gets “charged” for that amount? GF doesn’t have the answer to that right now and noted that he has some conversation with Google upcoming. Published work needs to be moved to appropriate storage places.
   2. Michael G:
      1. Is wired internet part of the general classrooms? GF: In existing rooms, they do, and the switches behind the wires are getting updated. Submit a ServiceNow ticket if there are any issues, and it will be routed to the correct team.
   3. Noah:
      1. Help Desk staff has been misinformed and given wrong advise to people. What is done for general Help Desk training? GF: The organizational transformation he’s spoken about requires quite a bit of changes that allows for training and scripts to support incidents. No Help Desk is perfect even with training and scripts, but we are working towards improvement on how we interact with the community and the quality of information provided.
3. CIO Update
   1. GF shared the Q2 ITS priorities. Sharing this lets URI know what ITS is focusing on. This gets shared with Marc, Barb, and Abby. The ITS Directors will review it this afternoon and, if there are no changes, it will be published on the website late today.
   2. AI at URI
      1. Research Computing has been approved as an institute and will be approved by FacSen in January. We are looking on how to make it an institute by FacSen rules. Does IT Gov wish to have any input?
         1. Marta: Expressed her appreciation for the work GF and Gaurav have done on this. Always the greatest concern is how institutes will be funding because the money is there but the mechanism and process for that funding is missing.
         2. Noah: The definition of center versus institute has been wishy-washy at best.
            1. GF: There is work on the University Manual which includes clearly defining this.
      2. Generative AI at URI: There are issues with people using the free versions of the large language models and the company’s use of your data for training on the LLM as the data is likely recoverable which we do not want URI community members to input sensitive data and information as it violates FERPA in the free version.
         1. OpenAI: It is ridiculously expensive, including the cheapest model of ChatGPT as it requires ~26,000 users enterprise licenses at a very high cost.
         2. There are alternatives that are less expensive and like 4O model. We are currently working to deploy Amplify at a much lower cost of ~$300,00 per year. We need to set up the infrastructure and maintain it. We are hoping to have it up and running for January Faculty Forum. The concern is will the community not use it because it’s not the fancy ChatGPT that is most well-known. Thoughts?
            1. Noah: It had to do with educating the community on options and the usefulness of whatever we choose. People will need to see demonstrations of what the product does through showcase pieces.
            2. Kirk: Student behavior is driven by convenience so whatever is selected, it needs to have ease of integration to what we use.
            3. Ian: If we are considering FERPA violations, if we enable it in email, will result in even more violations? GF: We are looking into this.
      3. SSO for eCampus Update: It’s the only major campus system that are not part of single sign-on yet.
         1. Mike K: The ability to authenticate with Azure works but the issues is with the integrations in eCampus like Flywire and Parchment. To test them is a time-consuming process so it’s difficult to give a timeframe when we can cut over with eCampus to SSO.
         2. GF: Security and Admin Apps have been working hard on the 160 integrations into eCampus with credentialing. We do not have the resources to do the regression tests that are needed so it’s a slower process.
4. IT Strategic Plan 12-14 Strategic Priorities
   1. Can we form a group of 3-4 people to review the URI SP and the ITS SP to whittle down the ITS SP to a manageable. Ian, Amanda, and Lindsey volunteered, and GF will send an email for people to respond to if they were not comfortable answering here.
   2. No further conversation occurred as we ran out of time.
5. Subcommittee Interest / Assignments
   1. GF requested that the group share the committee that they’re interested in or value to IT Gov.
   2. Noah: are we fragmenting IT Gov into silos instead of having one large IT Gov Committee or are these working groups that report back to IT Gov?
      1. GF: There was no desire to shrink IT Gov, rather we would reflect the Board of Trustee model with subcommittees that work separate from the regular meeting.
      2. Marta: I think we need further conversation about this and define the subcommittees before we focus.
         1. GF: We would do it by area focus rather than problem focus.
         2. Noah: We have standing committees and ad hoc committees in Fac Sen. He also thinks we need more discussion.
         3. Michael G: We have minimal area representation on IT Gov already, so we need more discussion about the subcommittees.
   3. Noah: Moves to keep the make of IT Gov as is and then form subcommittees after deliberation. Marta seconds. All in favor. Motion accepted.
      1. GF: Please feel free to start discussion in an email thread so we don’t have to wait until next month to begin the conversation.
6. Open Forum
   1. Kirk introduced himself and shared a bit about himself, and the rest of the group introduced themselves to Kirk.
   2. Upcoming Meeting
      1. Next meeting is Wednesday, December 4, 2024, at 11:00 AM via Zoom.